**Amendments to the Specification:**

Please replace the paragraph spanning pages 8 and 9 with the following amended paragraph:

Past experience has shown pressure drop differences in nozzles made to identical drawings by different suppliers. In one case, the difference was traced to the manufacturing processes and differing deburr methods. One of the methods combined with an outlet chamfer in addition to the inlet chamfer could have provided a nozzle that delivered the pressure drop required for the advanced fuel designs currently under development. However, specification, control and inspection of this manual deburr process proved to be very difficult. The venturi flow through hole design 54 of the debris filter bottom nozzle 12 was enhanced, from a manufacturing point of view, by optimizing the coolant flow paths through the nozzle flow plate 46. The straight bore flow holes, with single inlet chamfering that was described in the '507 patent, was replaced with ~~double inlet chamfers~~double chamfered inlet 56, i.e., two adjacent chamfers side by side one in front of the other, and a single outlet chamfer 58 to form the venturi 54 shown in Figure 5. The angles of the chamfers were optimized to provide the lowest pressure drop. In effect, they approximate a curved surface and streamline the flow through the holes 48. Controlling and inspecting the curved geometry is difficult and expensive. The inventors hereof have found, through computational Fluid Dynamics and experimentation, that as little as two straight chamfers, if configured properly, could develop flow similar to the curved geometry and result in a similar reduced pressure drop, with less cost. The preferred chamfer design is shown in the following table where Chamfer A is the chamfer closest to the inlet, Chamfer B is the chamfer adjacent Chamfer A and Chamfer C is at the outlet of the flow through holes. The plate thickness is also shown. The nominal values define the intended dimensions. The minimum and maximum values take into consideration the tolerances and provide acceptable ranges for the chamfer lengths.

| | Angle | Nominal Length (in.) | Maximum Length (in.) | Minimum Length (in.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chamfer A | 35° ± 3° | 0.017 (0.043 cm) | 0.039 (0.099 cm) | 0.012 (0.030 cm) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chamfer B | 15° ± 3° | 0.039 (0.099 cm) | 0.057 (0.145 cm) | 0.010 (0.025 cm) |
| Chamfer C | 10° ± 3° | 0.085 (0.361 cm) | 0.142 (0.361 cm) | 0.059 (1.397 cm) |
| Plate Thickness | -- | 0.560 (1.422 cm) | 0.583 (1.481 cm) | 0.550 (1.397 cm) |

It should be appreciated that the specific dimensions set forth in the foregoing table, while providing the desired reduction in pressure drop, are meant to be illustrative and are not meant to limit the scope of the invention. Other values for the reduction in pressure drop can be achieved using different angles and dimensions. Preferably the dimensions are expressed as a ratio of the chamfer length divided by plate thickness L/T.

| | Angle | Chamfer L/T | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Maximum | Minimum |
| Chamfer A | 2.33 x B | 0.071 | 0.020 |
| Chamfer B | 15° +/- 3° | 0.104 | 0.017 |
| Chamfer C | 0.67 x B | 0.258 | 0.101 |